

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the present application. With entry of this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 11-14, cancel claims 6 and 10 and add new claims 15-20. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 13 and 14 to recite a computer program “embedded in a computer readable medium” and executable by a searching server or a client terminal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13 and 14, as amended, are directed to statutory subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 8, 13 and 14 under § 112, second paragraph, for using a “thereby” phrase. The Examiner cited MPEP 2173.05(d) to support the rejection. However, this section merely refers to the use of exemplary claim language, such as “for example.” There is nothing in the section to suggest that a “thereby” phrase renders the claim indefinite. While Applicants traverse the rejection, they have nevertheless amended claims 1, 2, 8, 13 and 14 to delete the “thereby” phrases to better claim the invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt et al. (US 5893091). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention allows a user to conduct a search of information sites. The search can be based not only on an item keyword (e.g., commodity “A”) but also an action keyword (e.g., “purchase”). By allowing the user to include an action, the search can be more closely tailored to the user’s purpose.

The present invention also allows the user to request registering an information site with an item keyword and an action keyword. In response to the request, directory information of the site is registered with an item keyword and an action keyword (see, e.g., paragraph 0032 of the written description). Claim 1, as amended, recites “registering directory information of a new information

site in the search server together with an item keyword and an action keyword matching contents information presented by the new information site in response to a request for registration of the new information site from a client terminal.”

In contrast, Hunt fails to disclose any such registration of directory information, an item keyword and an action keyword in response to a request from a client. Hunt is directed to a method for managing and distributing information over a data network. A “Timely Information Server” receives or obtains new information from content providers referred to as “Timely Information Providers” (see Col. 5, lines 5-8; Col. 8, lines 8-12). The Timely Information Server analyzes the information and compares it with a keyword dictionary to create an alert composed of one or more keywords and one or more arguments (e.g., a URL) (see Col. 7, lines 53-59 and Fig. 8). The Timely Information Server then broadcasts the alert to subscriber clients. The clients compare the keywords in the alert to the local keyword profiles and any alert that meets the notification criteria is displayed. The keyword profile is provided to the clients by the Timely Information Server (see, e.g., Col. 9, line 57 to Col. 10, line 5). The profile can be updated by accessing the Timely Information Server or a Timely Information Provider’s profile definition webpage (see Col. 11, lines 36-48).

In short, Hunt merely discloses that a user can define his or her profile of keywords and receive alerts based on the profile. While the user in Hunt can certainly select what he or she receives, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the user can request the registration of directory information with an item keyword and an action keyword in a Timely Information Server. Nor is there any disclose that, based on the request, directory information with an item keyword and an action keyword is, in fact, registered. Thus, Hunt fails to disclose “registering directory information of a new information site in the search server together with an item keyword and an action keyword matching contents information presented by the new information site in response to a request for registration of the new information site from a client terminal.” Applicants, thus, respectfully traverse the Examiner’s contention that the claimed invention only differs by a degree from Hunt as well as his Official Notices, and respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Hunt for the reasons set forth above.

Applicants have amended claim 2 by incorporating the recitations of claim 6 and canceling claim 6. Claim 2, as amended, recites “a registering section, that responds to a request for registration of a new information site from a client terminal, for registering directory information of the new information site together with an item keyword and an action keyword matching the contents information presented by the new information site.” Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 and its remaining dependent claims 3-5 and 7 are patentable over Hunt for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Applicants note that claim 7 has been amended to change its dependency from claim 6 to claim 2.

Applicants have amended claim 8 by incorporating the recitations of claim 10 and canceling claim 10. Claim 8, as amended, recites “wherein the input section can send a request for registration of a new information site to the searching server, such that the searching server registers directory information of the new information site together with an item keyword and an action keyword matching the contents information presented by the new information site.” Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 and its remaining dependent claims 9 and 11 are patentable over Hunt for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Applicants note that claim 11 has been amended to change its dependency from claim 10 to claim 8.

Applicants have amended claim 12 to recite “wherein the index table memorizes a correspondence between a registered directory information of a new information site and an item keyword and an action keyword matching contents information presented by the new information site in response to a request for registration of the new information site from a client terminal to the searching server.” Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12, as amended, is patentable over Hunt for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicants have amended claim 13 to recite “registering directory information of a new information site together with an item keyword and an action keyword matching the contents information presented by the new information site in response to a request for registration of the new information site from a client terminal.” Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13, as amended, is patentable over Hunt for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicants have amended claim 14 to recite “sending a request for registration of a new information site to the searching server, such that the searching server registers directory information of the new information site together with an item keyword and an action keyword matching the contents information presented by the new information site.” Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14, as amended, is patentable over Hunt for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicants have added new dependent claims 15-20 depending from claims 1, 8, 12, 13 and 14 respectively. All of these dependent claims are directed to registering another action corresponding to the registered action keyword (see, e.g., paragraphs 0019-21 of the written description). It is believed that Hunt does not disclose the claimed subject matter.

Finally, Applicants are uncertain about the Examiner’s citation to Pasquali (WO 0057293). Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner clarify whether the claims are being rejected in view of Pasquali and, if so, provide a detailed summary of the rejection. To expedite prosecution, Applicants note that Pasquali is directed to a method of searching in which the query is based on a declarative sentence. The user selects a verb and a subject through pull-down menus and then selects a destination from a database of pre-configured network locations in relation to the selected verb and subject (see Fig. 1B and page 11, line 9 to page 12, line 2 of the corrected version). Once the sentence is chosen, the search is submitted. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Pasquali that directory information along with an item keyword and an action keyword can be registered in response to a request from a user.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If, for any reason, the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 892-5630 to discuss any steps necessary to place the application in condition for allowance.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. 393032029200.

Dated: August 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Mehran Arjomand

Registration No.: 48,231
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
555 West Fifth Street, Suite 3500
Los Angeles, California 90013
(213) 892-5200